

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are currently pending in the subject application. Claims 3 and 6 through 30 have been cancelled, claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 have been amended, and claims 31-53 are newly added as shown on pp. 2-8 of the Reply. The Examiner is thanked for courtesies extended during an interview conducted on November 25, 2008. The main focus of the interview was on newly proposed claims. While the presented matter generally related to all the claims, the crux was upon claim 1 and new claims 31-53. In particular, the reference Kuzma (US 5,781,901) was discussed in the interview. Amendments similar to those disclosed herein were presented to the Examiner. No formal agreement was reached. The interview was conducted with Ronald Krosky (Reg. No. 58,564) and Examiner Keefer. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 11-15 Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 11-15 have been cancelled and thus the rejection is rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that their rejection be withdrawn.

#### **II. Rejection of Claims 11-15 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kuzma (US 5,781,901). Claims 11-15 have been cancelled and thus the rejection is rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that their rejection be withdrawn.

#### **III. Rejection of Claims 1-10 and 16-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-10 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuzma (US 5,781,901) in view of Bavadekar (US 2003/0009571). Claims 3, 6-10, and 16-20 have been cancelled and thus the rejection is rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Referring to claim 1 there is recitation for a message receiver for a customizable tag-based message with a reference to a buffer. When information is transferred as part of the message, a portion of the information can be retained in a local buffer while a remainder of the

message is processed – a reference of the message indicates a location of the remainder. As such, claim 1 recites in part “...wherein the first memory portion and second memory portion integrates upon the message receiver...” (see paragraph 0041).

Kuzma relates to transferring of an e-mail message – when a message is received with an attachment, non-attachment portions are retained in a relatively local storage while the message portion without the storage is forwarded to a recipient. The storage in Kuzma is relatively local (not actually local) and thus does not integrate with the recipient as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Kuzma states “an attachment is stored in a storage means visible to the network and relatively local *to the sender*” (emphasis added) – see Kuzma summary. In Kuzma, there is never reference to local storage and every reference is made to relatively local storage. The storage is upon the sending side and not the receiving side as recited in claim 1. Additionally, there is strong explanation in Kuzma on why relatively local storage is used and thus it is a strong different from Kuzma to use locally integrated storage.

Moreover, Bavadekar does not teach using storage that is local and integrated upon the receiver. In Bavadekar, storage is used upon the web server 208 and not on the client 200A or 200B. Consequently, Kuzma nor Bavadekar either alone or in combination teach each and every element of claim 1. For at least the aforementioned reasons, claim 1 is not taught by Kuzma. Therefore, claim 1 should be removed and the case be placed in a condition of allowance. Claims 2, 4, and 5 are dependent upon claim 1 and therefore should also be placed in a condition for allowance.

#### **IV. Rejection of Claims 21-30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 21-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuzma (US 5,781,901) in view of Monaco et al. (US 6,314,402). Claims 21-30 have been cancelled and thus the rejection is rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that their rejection be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP2514US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Ronald Krosky/

Ronald Krosky

Reg. No. 58,564

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
57<sup>TH</sup> Floor, Key Tower  
127 Public Square  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731